

City Council Meeting Minutes

**September 19, 2017
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
7:00 PM**

Call to Order – Mayor Muckle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: *Mayor Robert Muckle
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton
Councilmember Jay Keany
Councilmember Chris Leh
Councilmember Susan Loo
Councilmember Dennis Maloney
Councilmember Ashley Stolzmann*

Staff Present: *Heather Balser, Interim City Manager
Megan Davis, Intergovernmental Affairs Director
Rob Zuccaro, Director of Planning & Building Safety
Lisa Ritchie, Associate Planner
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk*

Others Present: *Sam Light, City Attorney*

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton called for changes to the agenda and hearing none, moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Lipton. All were in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Mayor Muckle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Councilmember Stolzmann. All in favor.

- A. *Approval of Bills***
- B. *Approval of Minutes: September 5, 2017***
- C. *Approval of Contract Between the City of Louisville and Farnsworth Group for the Sid Copeland Water Treatment Plant Plate Settlers Design***
- D. *Approval of Contracts Between the City of Louisville and Meurer Research, Inc. and Orthos Liquid Systems for the Purchase of Equipment for the Howard Berry Water Treatment Plant Upgrade Project***
- E. *Approval of Contract Between the City of Louisville and Moltz Construction for the Construction of the Wastewater Treatment Plant Aerobic Digester Blower Replacement***
- F. *Award Bid for 2017 CIPP Sewer Lining***
- G. *Resolution No. 52, Series 2017 – A Resolution Authorizing the Assignment of the City's Private Activity Bond Allocation for 2017 to the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Collins, DBA Housing Catalyst; Providing Other Details in Connection Therewith; and Providing an Effective Date***

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Councilmember Keany thanked staff and the contractors for the South Street Underpass opening.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Interim City Manager Balser stated Bus to Work Day, held in conjunction with Boulder, Boulder County, Lafayette, and Superior, is September 28. She encouraged everyone to join in and check out the rider stations.

REGULAR BUSINESS

RESOLUTION NO. 53, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 109,396 SQUARE FOOT BUILDING AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS FOR A FED EX BOULDER COUNTY VAN FACILITY AT LOT 1, BLOCK 3, THE BUSINESS CENTER AT CTC (CASE # PUD-0059-2017; FED EX FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT)

Planner Ritchie stated this is a request for a Final Planned Unit Development to allow the construction of a 109,396 sq ft building and associated site improvements for a FedEx Boulder County Van Facility. All notification requirements have been met. The property is located in the northeast area of the Colorado Tech Center, with frontage on Highway 42, South 104th Street, Taylor Avenue and CTC Blvd. The PUD proposes to develop the entire block.

The property is platted at Lot 1, Block 3, the Business Center at CTC approved in 1998. The PUD proposes a single structure with a shipping center open to the public on the west side of the building, with the remainder of the building used for distribution and vehicle maintenance. The site layout includes a parking shipping center on the western edge of the property and employee and Fed Ex van parking along the southern and eastern property sides.

Ritchie reviewed the area topography, the construction materials for the building, and the landscape proposal.

Ritchie stated staff has some architectural concerns about this proposal. Originally this lot was required to meet commercial design standards (CDDSG), but the City approved a rezoning of the site in 2016 to allow industrial uses but also required architectural standards above those in the IDDSG. Staff has concerns this proposal doesn't meet the intent of Ordinance 1725, Series 2016 as there is no horizontal articulation on the north and south sides of the building.

Ordinance 1725, Series 2016 , Condition A, includes several provisions that apply to this development including that landscaping and berming in Easement Area No. 2 and Outlot C meet the standards of the CDDSG. Staff feels this proposal meets this condition.

Ordinance No 1725 Condition C requires incorporation of a City/CTC entry feature on Outlot C acceptable to the City and to be determined at the time of PUD approval. The PUD includes the same wayfinding monument sign that City Council is considering for use throughout the City at identified entry areas. In addition, the development agreement requires that the City to provide a design by a particular date and if not, the applicant will pay a sum toward that sign. The development agreement is to be considered as a part of this application.

To parking and vehicular circulation, staff has concerns about the access drive that enters the property on the western portion at CTC Blvd. Staff acknowledges there are other access drives crossing the conservation easement on other properties in CTC; however these access drives are acceptable because there are no reasonable alternatives. Staff finds the access drive on the west has reasonable alternatives and could be relocated out of the easement.

Ritchie noted staff has concerns related to architectural enhancements beyond the IDDSG. If Council finds the application meets the intent of Ordinance 1725, then staff recommends approval of Resolution 53, Series 2017 for a final Planned Unit Development for Lot 1, Block 3, Colorado Technological Center. If Council finds the application does not meet the intent of Ordinance 1725, then staff recommends Council continue the application and provide further direction.

Staff recommends the following Condition: The northern access drive to CTC Blvd located in Easement Area No. 2 shall be relocated out of Easement Area No. 2

Jim Vasbinder, Etkin Johnson, distributed supplemental information including new renderings of the proposed building. All loading is done inside the building, not on the docks. There are three dock doors on the south side of the facility that will receive and ship out large containers. The facility will serve Boulder, some of Adams, and some of Denver counties. The lease with FedEx is fully executed pending approval of this facility. Planning Commission had a detailed discussion about the design of the building. Following the Planning Commission meeting, they reduced the height of the building, added additional glass sections; added reveal lines in the panels for design affect; and changed the landscape plan for additional shrubs, trees, and additional landscaping. He stated he believes they have responded to the comments from the Planning Commission. Regarding the access point at the NW corner of the site, this design gives limited access only for vans and employees; it is not available to customers. This will be a secure facility, the general public has only one access point to the building.

Vasbinder noted Public Works did not have an issue with the NW entrance to the facility. He noted the conservation easement on the north and east sides of the building and the driveway that crosses that easement. This is how other buildings use this easement. We have gotten permission from Council's before for such a crossing.

Vasbinder added the City and the CTC Metro District are working on traffic signals at Dillon Road and 104th Street and at Hwy 42 and 104th Street. These traffic signal designs are underway and will jointly construct the signal improvements. They hope to have them operational sometime in 2018 which will alleviate some of the traffic congestion in CTC.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked Ritchie about the north and south elevations where staff has concerns. He asked what would be the minimum changes that would resolve staff's concern. Ritchie stated there are no horizontal articulations on this 550 foot side of the building. Staff has suggested some changes such as bump outs or canopies that might be made to the building to enhance the building.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked if material variation might soften the appearance. Ritchie said yes, those types of changes might satisfy staff's concerns.

Councilmember Keany asked Vasbinder if the vans are stored indoors or out. Vasbinder stated it is a combination of both, with the majority inside the facility. Councilmember Keany asked what changes might be made to the north side facing Hwy 42, including possibly more landscaping. He noted it is a very visible wall to Hwy 42 and additional screening would be better.

Vasbinder stated they have added additional berming and enhanced the landscaping as well and lowered the building elevation to soften the impact on Hwy 42 traffic. There are glass and metal doors on these walls; it is not all concrete panels. The flat panels do have texture and vertical articulations. The IDDSG does not have criteria for articulations. This is a smart looking building and will be a benefit to the CTC.

Director Zuccaro confirmed this is zoned industrial with an enhanced architectural design requirement. He stated there are properties in CTC that are industrial uses that are required to meet the commercial guidelines. Council did zone this as industrial but with a higher level of design.

Councilmember Maloney asked how this proposal is above the IDDSG standards. Vasbinder stated this proposal brings in different materials for a specialized building for a specific tenant. They are working to satisfy both the City and FedEx. They have brought in materials for the building including metal, form liners, and clerestory windows on all sides. There are vertical articulations on all elevations and horizontal articulations on the east and west sides. He believes this proposal has improved or enhanced the building above the industrial requirements.

Councilmember Maloney asked how the perspective from Hwy 42 will look. Ritchie stated the building will be visible, but the landscaping meets the intent of the design guidelines. Both the Open Space and Parks and Public Landscaping Boards reviewed this plan and stated it is acceptable. Councilmember Leh asked if denser landscaping could be considered. Ritchie stated once this is mature, the landscaping should be adequate although more could be added.

Public Comments

Evelyn Logan, Lafayette resident who lives on the adjacent open space, stated her concerns of sound and light from the facility. The existing buildings already are bright. She hopes this facility would not have lights that shine outwards. She is concerned about sound as well, particularly if there are nighttime hours. She would like more landscaping along the east elevation to protect the homes to the east.

Anita Teague, Lafayette resident, agreed with the previous speaker and stated she appreciates the Council considering the architecture and how it affects neighbors. She is most concerned about light and sound.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated there is a lot to like about this proposal, but would like to see a few things to dress up the building. Council made a significant concession to rezone this to industrial and expected a higher level of design on this building. He would like to see more articulation, materials, and color which would be helpful to the proposal. Would like to give staff the discretion to incorporate some of these changes and approve the proposal.

Mayor Muckle stated he thinks the proposal meets the requirements of the ordinance, particularly the landscaping enhancements. He asked about the lighting issue. Vasbinder stated all lights will be LEDs and all will be cutoff fixtures to minimize bleed off to neighbors. As to noise, the operation that creates noise is inside the building including all loading and unloading, only sound should be traffic coming and going.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she agrees with Mayor Pro Tem Lipton. She asked staff if we will be able to provide the applicant with an approved sign design by March 1, 2018. Ritchie stated staff thinks this is possible if Council approves the design in the wayfinding plan in October. Director Zuccaro stated if no design is approved in October the developer will provide a cash payment. Councilmember Stolzmann stated she would prefer we simply require the developer to provide the sign without the caveat; we should not tie this to the rest of the process. Councilmember Stolzmann stated her concern that in the past we have taken payments for projects and later this payment doesn't cover the cost of the project when it is finally installed.

Vasbinder noted in the PUD package there is a sign, designed by the City, and there is a cost associated with it. They will build the sign that is in the package if Council agrees to that.

Mayor Muckle supports Councilmember Stolzmann's suggestion.

Councilmember Loo supports the sign process as well. Regarding the landscaping she is concerned about the surrounding property that the City owns and stated the City should put in more landscaping. She supports the entrances as designed. She agreed with staff to have more interest on the north façade. She agrees with Mayor Pro Tem Lipton to move forward with approval and allow changes to be determined by staff.

Councilmember Maloney supports the project but also appreciates the concern that the north side is basically a flat façade. He supports Mayor Pro Tem Lipton's suggestion of more articulation there be a condition on the approval. He would like the condition stated clearly.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked for more diverse materials on the north side and/or color, and possibly some articulation. He stated he doesn't want to cause any functional issues for the building, just have more interesting architecture.

Director Zuccaro stated staff would prefer a continuation than a condition on the approval so Council can see exactly what it will look like and react to it prior to approval. If it is conditional approval, staff would need to know how often articulation is wanted and the materials should be specified.

Vasbinder stated the proposal as presented is already highly detailed and he doesn't want to design on the fly. There is metal on a substantial portion of the north façade already. There is a 100-foot setback required and the flat façade on the north side meets that setback rule.

Councilmember Leh stated Council didn't clarify things as it should have with the rezoning ordinance. He stated we should not be designing on the fly. He encouraged Council to approve it; if Council would like more design on the north façade, the hearing should be continued.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve the resolution without the staff condition to move the drive and also including Councilmember Stolzmann's recommendation on the signage. Councilmember Maloney seconded the motion.

Attorney Light suggested the condition read: Revise the development agreement to remove the cash payment option for the City/CTC entry feature so as to provide that the developer shall install the City/CTC entry features concurrent with site improvements with the design provided by the City by March 1, 2018.

Mayor Muckle accepted that language. Councilmember Maloney accepted.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked Director Zuccaro if additional design is requested, would it take only one hearing or additional hearings. Director Zuccaro stated it would only take one additional hearing.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated he won't vote for the motion. He stated he was disappointed there are not more architectural enhancements and other features. We have already made a concession on this property and the north side design does not meet the standard in the ordinance. Continuing to another hearing will meet the City's interest. The building will be there for 50 years, so let's take the time to get it right. It needs some improvement to dress up that side.

Councilmember Keany asked Vasbinder if the 100-foot setback was reduced, would it allow for more articulation on the north side. Vasbinder suggested a compromise that the horizontal articulations on the east and west be recreated on the north side with the right to move three feet into the setback.

Councilmember Keany asked staff if that would be acceptable. Director Zuccaro stated the code does allow for architectural features to encroach not more than three feet into the setback.

Councilmember Loo stated she supports the motion on the table or with minor modifications. She noted that the flat façade is more functional for the use of the building. We should not redesign this on the fly. The building will be redone eventually, this is not the same building we will see in 30 years. She supports the motion as proposed.

Mayor Muckle offered an amendment to the motion to add horizontal articulations at the east and west end of the north façade consistent with the articulations with the other corners of the buildings to encroach not more than three feet into the 100-foot building setback. Councilmember Maloney accepted the amendment.

Councilmember Stolzmann agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Lipton's comments. She stated these are small issues and a little bit more time will allow for consensus and the best outcome. Councilmember Stolzmann made a substitute motion to continue the resolution and give staff direction to work with the applicant to incorporate the articulations that he has described into the northeast corner and to make the other amendments discussed to increase articulations and materials and come back to the next meeting. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton seconded the motion.

Councilmember Leh asked what the advantage would be to continuing this for more time. Councilmember Stolzmann stated it would give staff time to make sure the articulations meet the code and are workable. This gives staff and the applicant time to determine if it works and Council can document the new design and know exactly what we are approving.

Roll call vote on substitute motion from Councilmember Stolzmann:

Vote: Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 4, No = 3). **Yes:** Council Member Stolzmann, Council Member Leh, Council Member Keany, Mayor Pro Tem Lipton. **No:** Council Member Loo, Council Member Maloney, Mayor Muckle.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated he would like to see color renditions on all proposed buildings to really see what is proposed. Director Zuccaro stated if that is the standard Council wants it needs to be in an ordinance. Councilmember Leh stated we should amend the ordinance.

DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – REGIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING ISSUES

Megan Davis, Intergovernmental Affairs Director, stated this conversation is to prepare for the regional housing summit on September 29; specifically to consider a statement on affordable housing for the summit. She noted some of the housing challenges currently facing the area include the cost of rental or ownership of housing, homelessness, transportation impacts, employee/workforce availability. She noted the

Kestrel project is now being filled with residents from Louisville, residents employed in Louisville, and elderly residents.

Davis stated the Countywide goal to address housing includes: 15,000 – 22,000 low to middle income affordable housing units by 2035 and an additional 9,000 – 16,000 affordable homes (3,100 in Southeast Boulder County) on top of the existing affordable housing stock.

She reviewed the proposed statement which was drawn from existing city documents and City Council policies: *As stated in the City of Louisville comprehensive plan, we value Families and Individuals, where the City accommodates the needs of all individuals in all stages of life through our parks, trails, and roadway design, our City services, and City regulations to ensure they provide an environment which accommodates individual mobility needs, quality of life goals, and housing options. The Boulder County Regional Affordable Housing Plan illuminates an issue that we are very familiar with here in Louisville: Changing demographics and economic influences have impacted the availability of the full range of housing options within our community. The policies outlined in our Comprehensive Plan demonstrate our support for a diversity of housing types, and specify that diverse housing opportunities shall be available for residents of varying income levels within our community. We are committed to identifying actions within the City of Louisville that will build upon current efforts to advance these affordable housing policies. In addition, we recognize that a lack of affordable housing is a regional issue, and will continue to work in collaboration with the Boulder County Regional Housing Partnership and our neighboring communities toward achieving countywide housing goals.*

Davis noted some other opportunities for Council to consider as next steps include: general strategies, financial options, regulatory alignment, land opportunities, collaboration and partnerships.

Councilmember Leh asked if a specific reference to percentages should be added to the statement. Davis stated that could be added if Council wants to be that specific.

Councilmember Maloney asked what “aligning local government regulations” means. Davis stated there may be ways to align regulatory tools with other communities that could be helpful for developers to know what the opportunities are. However, it depends on each community and what they want to do. Director Zuccaro stated some examples could include by-right variances or modifications, extra considerations for PUD regulations, or fee waivers. Mayor Muckle noted some of these issues will be discussed at the housing summit.

Mayor Muckle stated he likes the statement as presented.

Public Comments – None.

Councilmember Leh stated the Consortium of Cities has been looking at this for a few years. He would like some consensus from the Council on how to address this at the summit and some agreement that we want to work cooperatively on these issues with other communities. Regarding the statement, he would like to include an affirmation of what we have done with the Kestrel project; a statement of the City's position on the overall goals; emphasis on voluntary efforts; recognition this is a regional issue; affirming the goal set forth in the report; and looking forward to working with other communities.

Councilmember Stolzmann agreed with Councilmember Leh. She would like to include the percentage goal in the statement. She would like more specificity and suggested including a mix of affordable incomes, dispersed throughout the county, respecting individual community character, and mix of existing and new housing. We need substantial funding in the County and she stated she would support a county-wide funding mechanism such as a progressive, county-wide property tax. A property tax would address the impacts that commercial properties put on the market. She suggested removing the student population from the conversation as it should be viewed separately. She would like to list strategic tools cities might want to employ so not view this policy as competition between cities. She stated there might be a more positive ways to use the information in the County's draft plan in the packet.

Councilmember Stolzmann presented the Council with informational slides for councilmembers going into the meeting.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton would like more clarity on guiding principles including maintaining our community character. There is no appetite for high density or any residential development in Louisville. We have to recognize our residents' desires. He wants the statement to recognize the individual fiscal constraints of each community. He is sensitive to preserving our sovereignty in this conversation; our land use decision making and regulations are ours, we shouldn't change for other communities; the goals should be voluntary, not mandates. He suggested some consideration of school crowding and impacts on the school district; communities need to coordinate with the school district.

Councilmember Loo agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Lipton and noted there is no community support for raising building heights or more density. She would like to take inclusionary zoning off the table for consideration; it is not a good idea for us in Louisville. We need to have one voice going into the summit.

Mayor Muckle noted the goals as written may not all be doable here and we don't like being told what we should do from the rest of the county. He stated he is reluctant to put specific numbers in the statement. He likes the statement as is. He noted he is supportive on affordable housing in Louisville and we need to find what works best for Louisville.

Councilmember Leh was concerned he was hearing a bit of resistance to cooperating with other communities; he stated he understands fiscal and community constraints, but it is a mistake to discuss sovereignty at this summit. We need to achieve larger goals and if we go in with that statement it may create unnecessary rancor. He would like to emphasize voluntary ways to comply and what we are already doing.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated we need some statement about community character local control and voluntary compliance. He doesn't want to agree to "regulatory alignment" without it being better defined.

Councilmember Leh stated it doesn't have to be a defined regulation every city has to adopt, but more each community deciding how to align their regulations better to encourage affordable housing.

Councilmember Loo stated anything that has to do with changes to the planning processes and land use process needs to be more clear. She would like a sense from Council on what we all agree on and what we don't.

Mayor Muckle noted he is hoping to use the conference to simply learn what we may be able to do; not to be adversarial.

Councilmember Maloney stated we need to go in with a positive attitude and see what possibilities there may be for solving this and for funding; but we do represent our residents and have to stand up for that.

Councilmember Stolzmann would like specific points in the statement that the group can use at the summit. Without specifics it is hard to have good conversations with others at the summit. We want to go and be positive and open to learning things and recognize past efforts to address this issue. We have a unique identity so we will approach these problems differently in our community.

Councilmember Leh stated he thinks there is consensus on some things such as we don't want increased density, we don't have a lot of land available, and we are not interested in inclusionary zoning. We agree on all of those issues. But we can also discuss land use policies that could better promote and incentivize affordable housing. We always know this is our decision to make. Much of this is not controversial, we all agree we don't want any of this plan imposed on us from other communities. We should stick with what has worked in our community. He would like to include the 10-15% figure in the statement; knowing we need a county-wide funding source. We need to be able to respond that we have done a lot of things and don't get antagonistic, emphasize voluntary compliance, and those ideas that fit with our community.

Councilmember Loo asked if there is agreement that a new funding source is key. This is not the most cost effective way to solve this, but it does work in Louisville. Members indicated there is agreement on this.

Mayor Muckle asked if we want to add a percentage in the statement knowing it is aspirational. The 10-15% goal is regional, not specific to Louisville. Members agreed to add it.

Mayor Muckle would like to make a statement that we support a regional, county-wide funding source; along with adding our history of support of the Kestrel project.

Councilmember Leh would like adding voluntary efforts and incentives to the statement.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton would like to make sure the summit is used to understand what “regulatory alignment” would mean to Louisville and get clarity on this. Councilmember Leh asked staff to let organizers know “regulatory alignment” is an issue for Louisville.

Councilmember Loo noted some of the information in the packet discusses a variety of land use approvals (variances, heights, mixed use, etc.) that could be approved administratively by staff which would be a huge change for Louisville.

Interim City Manager Balser noted a wide range of tools can be used, and not all tools need to be used in every community. We are looking for broad consensus, not specific details and to see what opportunities are out there and the challenges.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton left the meeting at 9:48 pm.

Director Zuccaro discussed the city’s mobile home policy. Since April, staff has reached out to the owner of the mobile home park and discussed with Boulder County Housing Authority how best to preserve the park for the future and what tools are out there. The owner is receptive to working with the City; they are interested in continued ownership and are interested in what the City may be able to offer. The Housing Authority has not managed a mobile home park, but is interested in the idea. Boulder owns two parks and they facilitate a resident-owned community. He stated infrastructure is key to longevity of the park.

He noted three possible considerations for the Council: a grant program, loans, funding for infrastructure; deed restrictions or rezoning, and transferable development rights to other parts of the City. There are many possibilities depending how Council wants to move forward.

Public Comments

Nancy McDonald, 400 South Boulder Road, #7, lives in Parco Dello Zingaro and stated she was curious what Council wants to do. She stated Council should make sure to get input from residents as well as the owner.

Mayor Muckle stated the goal is to preserve the park and/or the affordable housing use of that land. He stated somehow compensating for development right makes sense generally, but no one is sure how to do that.

Councilmember Loo is interested in preserving what is currently there for those living there. There are several ways to make it affordable, but she does want to leave it as a mobile home park. Mayor Muckle agreed.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated the neighborhood is a benefit to the community as it is now. If we do nothing there is market value pressure on the property. She stated inaction would likely result in change, so we need to plan for what could happen on the property. We need to understand all options.

Councilmember Maloney agreed with Councilmember Stolzmann's comments. This is the right thing for us to be doing and we need to learn more about what possibilities there are to support this community.

Mayor Muckle stated staff should keep working on this and bring back more information.

Councilmember Loo noted this could be an expensive proposition so residents should know this isn't likely to happen quickly. She doesn't want to raise expectations; this likely will happen very slowly.

RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD

ORDINANCE NO. 1746, SERIES 2017 – AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD TO SERVE AS AN ADVISORY BOARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING 10/03/17

RESOLUTION NO. 54, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION SETTING FORTH THE TERMS, RESPONSIBILITIES, DUTIES AND OTHER MATTERS CONCERNING THE RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD – *continue to 10/03/17*

City Attorney Light introduced the ordinance by title on first reading. Mayor Muckle moved to approve Ordinance No. 1746, Series 2017 on first reading, send it out for publication and set the public hearing for October 3, 2017; Councilmember Leh seconded. Voice vote: All in favor.

Members continued Resolution No. 54, Series 2017 to the October 3 meeting.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

None.

**COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF
FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Councilmember Stolzmann reported the Library Board of Trustees is working on a Read Baby Read program to get every baby born at Avista a book and a library card application.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned the meeting at 10:04 pm.

Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk